DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 057 CS 507 654

AUTHOR Slaughter, Gerald Z.; And Others
TITLE The Congruity of Communicator Style Expectations and Experiences and Its Influence upon Subordinates' Satisfaction with Supervision.
PUB DATE Oct 91
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (77th, Atlanta, GA, October 31-November 3, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Analysis of Variance; Communication Research; *Employer Employee Relationship; Interpersonal Communication; *Job Satisfaction; *Organizational Communication; Research Methodology; *Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Behavior; Communication Satisfaction; *Communication Styles; Norton Communicator Style Measure; Supervisor Subordinate Relationship

ABSTRACT

Based on a model of human symbolic activity, a study examined the influence of congruity of communicator style expectations of and experiences with a supervisor as it affects subordinates' satisfaction with supervision. Nine supervisors and 87 subordinates employed at the Hose Production Center of a national tire and rubber corporation were surveyed with the Norton Communicator Style Measure. Results indicated an overall significant F statistic for 8 of the 11 communicator style subconstructs, when a single factor analysis of variance was computed. Post hoc comparisons indicated that subordinates' satisfaction with supervision was influenced by different types of congruity and by the nature of the communicator style subconstructs. Results revealed that strong congruity does not necessarily lead to high satisfaction. This study represents a new way of investigating the supervisor-subordinate relationship. (Forty-four references and 5 appendixes which include the survey, analytical components, and 11 tables of data are attached.) (PRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

The Congruity of Communicator Style Expectations and Experiences and Its Influence Upon Subordinates' Satisfaction With Supervision

ED340057

Gerald Z. Slaughter
Department of Continuing Education and Professional Studies
Bellevue College
Bellevue, Nebraska 68005

Jerry D. Jorgensen
Department of Speech Communication
South Dakota State University
Brookings, S.D. 57007

John L. Petelle
Department of Speech Communication
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68588

CS507654

Running Head: Communicator Style

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jerry Jorgensen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Based upon a model of human symbolic activity, this study examined the influence of congruity of communicator style expectations of and experiences with one's supervisor as it affects subordinates' satisfaction with supervision. Computing a single factor analysis of variance revealed an overall significant F statistic for eight communicator style subconstructs. Post hoc comparisons indicated that subordinates' satisfaction with supervision was influenced by different types of congruity.

The Congruity of Communicator Style Expectations and Experiences and Its Influence upon Subordinates' Satisfaction with Supervision

The significance of congruity as an issue in supervisor-subordinate relationships has been noted by several scholars in organizational communication. For example, research has centered on congruity issues such as role congruence in supervisor-subordinate relationships (e.g., Baird & Diebolt, 1976; Greene, 1972), perceptions of authority in supervisor-subordinate relationships (e.g., Boyd & Jensen, 1972), and congruence and job satisfaction (e.g., White, 1977; Wiggings, Lederer, Salkowe & Rys, 1983). Thus, research has linked the concept of congruity to specific organizational outcomes.

At the same time theorists have also acknowledged the significance of expectancy theory to organizational relationships. Beginning with Lewin (1938) and Tolman (1932) the concept of expectation has been viewed initially as a psychological process and later, as theories of motivation (e.g., Maddi, Hoover, & Kobasa, 1980; Matsui & Ohtsuka, 1978; Russell, Studstill, & Grant, 1981). Motivation theory linked the concept of expectation to job performance (e.g., Galbraith & Cummings, 1967; Georgopolous, Mahoney, & Jones, 1957; Lawler & Porter, 1967; Porter & Lawler, 1968; Vroom, 1964) and successful organizational outcomes such as satisfaction(e.g., Heneman and Schwab,1972; Wernimont, 1971). Additional research lead to studies involving the communication of expectations about the workplace (Machin, 1977; Machin 1973).

While not addressing the issues of congruent behavior and behavior based upon shared expectations, Norton (1978) introduced the idea that people manifest behavior in the form of some type of "style." Taking a "communication perspective" to congruity and expectancy and their relationship to actual experiences, Petelle, Slaughter, & Jorgensen (1988) noted that such behaviors are engaged in through symbolic activity.

Thus, a groundwork is laid for integrating the behavioral dimensions of congruity, expectancy, experiences, and communicator style of such symbolic activity.

While numerous studies have examined the supervisor-subordinate relationship from the vantage point of subordinate satisfaction with supervision (e.g. Wheeless, Wheeless, & Howard, 1984), the linking of the variables of congruity, expectations, and style of communication has yet to be investigated. Using a model of human symbolic activity (Petelle, Slaughter, & Jorgensen, 1988) as a starting point, this study examines the influence of congruity of expectations of and experiences with communicator style as they affect subordinate satisfaction with supervision.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Congruity of Expectation and Experience

A connection between the concept of congruity and communication has been recognized by Hatfield and Huseman (1982). They examined perceptual communication congruity between supervisors and subordinates and its effect on overall job satisfaction. They investigated the perceptual congruity of 14 specific communication variables and the relationship of these variables to job satisfaction. A factor analysis indicated that the 14 communication items loaded on three factors: coordination, participation, and expression. While small, but statistically significant relationships were found, three important points are worth mentioning regarding Hatfield and Huseman's study: first, perceptual congruity is related to important organizational outcomes (e.g., satisfaction with supervision); next, the 14 communication variables used in this study do not exhaust the many kinds of communication occurring within the supervisor-subordinate relationship; and finally, the researchers suggested that future research should include "more extensive and representative communication items" (p. 356).

The connection between the notion of congruity and expectations has been noted by Tsui (1984). Linking expectations and managerial effectiveness with "reputational effectiveness" (the degree of congruence in role expectations), Tsui (1984) suggested that this congruence "depends on the nature of the multiple sets of expectations and the manager's ability to meet these expectations by behaving in the manner that is preferred by his or her role senders" (p. 31).

More recently, Cahn (1986) maintained that verbal and nonverbal communication behaviors, as they impact upon organizational effectiveness, "depend to a great extent on the superior and subordinate sharing perceived understanding or the feeling of being understood" (p. 20). Thus, Cahn implied the potential significance of congruity of communication expectations between supervisors and subordinates. Whereas Tsui (1984) made the connection between congruity and expectations in general, Cahn (1986) suggested a connection between congruity and communication expectations in particular.

Previous researchers suggested a positive relationship between perceptual congruence and outcome variables such as satisfaction with supervision (e.g., Boyd & Jensen, 1972; Hatfield & Huseman,1982; Petelle, Slaughter, & Jorgensen, 1988). Hatfield and Huseman (1982) stated, "A typical conclusion in the congruence research is that absence of perceptual congruence is evidence of communication problems . . . " (p. 350). This view failed to take into account that congruity concerning undesirable communication behaviors may also be problematic. Moreover, contrary to prevalent perspectives, Pazy and Zin (1987) suggested that incongruence between people and work environment is not necessarily a disadvantage and that incongruence is not universally inferior to congruence.

Therefore, for this study, the concept of congruity must be viewed along a continuum of "strength" ranging from perfect congruity to a complete lack of congruity.

While theoretically there are infinite degrees of congruity along the continuum, this research focuses only on 2 ranges: strong congruity and weak congruity. Viewing congruity in this way suggests 4 distinct types: First, there are 2 types of strong congruity, labeled Type I congruity and Type IV congruity. Type I congruity is a category involving low expectation and low experience while Type IV congruity is a category involving high expectation and high experience. In general, the nature of the variables under investigation should indicate which type is more favorable. For example, if the dependent variable is satisfaction with supervision, one may suggest that subordinates who have low expectations and low experiences (Type I congruity) of their supervisors' competence (independent variable) may have low satisfaction with supervision. Similarly, subordinates who have high expectations and high experiences (Type IV congruity) of their supervisors' competence may have high satisfaction with supervision. In this particular example, there are two types of strong congruity; however, given the nature of the variables, only Type IV congruity would be desirable.

Demonstrated in the example above, the 2 types of strong congruity are important to consider. At the same time, however, there are 2 types of weak congruity labeled Type II congruity and Type III congruity. Type II congruity is a category involving high expectation and low experience while Type III congruity is a category involving low expectation and high experience . For example, using the same dependent variable (satisfaction with supervision), one may suggest that subordinates who have high expectations and low experiences (Type II congruity) of their supervisors' competence (independent variable) may have low satisfaction with supervision. Similarly, subordinates who have low expectations and high experiences (Type IV congruity) of their supervisors' competence (independent variable) may have high satisfaction with

supervision. In this particular example, there are two kinds of weak congruity; however, given the nature of the variables, only Type III congruity would be desirable.

To summarize the previous examples, Type I congruity (strong) and Type II congruity (weak) may be associated with lower satisfaction with supervision. On the other hand, Type III congruity (weak) and Type IV congruity (strong) may be associated with higher satisfaction with supervision. In another example where the variable is one that may be considered undesirable (e.g., arrogance), the implications for satisfaction may change. Type I congruity and Type II congruity may be associated with higher satisfaction while Type III congruity and Type IV may be associated with lower satisfaction. Thus, in this study, it is important to look not only at strong congruity of expectations and experiences (Type I and Type IV), but also at weak congruity of expectations and experiences (Type II and Type III).

The Expectancy Model of Human Symbolic Activity

Building upon Thayer's (1963) conceptualization of administrative communication, Slaughter, Petelle, and Jorgensen (1987) explored the groundwork for an expectancy model focusing on the notion that congruent communicative expectations and/or experiences would enhance the supervisor-subordinate relationship. Extending Thayer's concept of a communicative perspective, Petelle, Slaughter, and Jorgensen (1988) proposed an expectancy model of human symbolic activity emphasizing both within-person and between-person orientations. This model extended the significance of expectancy theory in organizational relationships to include the importance of congruent communicative expectations and/or experiences and how the degree of congruity (@)may influence other variables (e.g., satisfaction with supervision).

The expectancy model of human symbolic activity is centered around 8 general components (see Appendix A), each represented by a three-letter expression (PTO, PRO,

PTS, PRS, BTO, BRO, BTS, BRS) with the first letter representing a subject, the second representing a cognitive act and the third representing an object. A subject is either a supervisor (P) or a subordinate (B). A cognitive act is the perceptual process of sorting, selecting, and interpreting communicative expectations (T) and experiences (R). An object is either "self" (S) or "other" (O). For example, in the expression PTO, the first letter, (P), represents the subject, the supervisor. The second letter, (T), represents the cognitive act referring to a communicative expectation. The third letter, (O), refers to "other," representing the object to which the cognitive act is directed. In short, the expression PTO is a simple way to represent the supervisor's expectation of other. From these 8 components or three-letter expressions, 64 combinations or dimensions of the supervisor-subordinate relationship were generated (see Appendix B).

Jorgensen, Slaughter, and Petelle (1988) conducted a preliminary analysis of the dimensions of PTO @ PRO, BTO @ BRO, PTO @ BTO, and PRO @ BRO of the expectancy model. The findings of PTO @ PRO and BTO @ BRO indicated that both supervisors and subordinates reported higher communication expectations of each other than they experienced with each other. The finding of PTO @ BTO indicated that both supervisors and subordinates had relatively high communication expectations for each other. The finding of PRO @ BRO suggested that the supervisors had a higher rating of experiences with their subordinates than the subordinates had with their supervisors. The finding of BTO @ BRO indicated that the subordinates' communication expectations of the supervisors significantly exceeded the subordinates' experiences with the supervisors (expectations higher than experiences). Overall, the results of this study revealed that as congruity decreased (expectation higher than experiences) satisfaction with supervision decreased.

Building upon the work of Heider (1958) who introduced the notion of internal or "within-person" congruity, viewing it as the balance from within the cognitive structure of one person and Newcomb (1961) who considered a "between-person" theory suggesting that congruity was determined by comparing two persons' orientation to an issue, object, or third person, a second study examined within-person and between-person congruity of communicative expectation behaviors in supervisor-subordinate relationships (Slaughter, Petelle, & Jorgensen, 1990). The purpose of this study was to determine whether the congruity of within-person dimensions and/or between-person dimensions (see Appendix C) correlated with subordinates' satisfaction with supervision. Although the results of this study indicated that both the within-person and between-person orientations correlated with satisfaction with supervision, the correlation coefficients were low (within-person, $r = .37$, $p < .01$ and between-person, $r = .22$, $p < .05$). While satisfaction with supervision correlated significantly with both within and between-person dimensions, the low correlation could be attributed to the exploratory nature of this study.

The Concept of Communication Style

It seems that a critical link between the congruity of expectations and experiences and the issue of the supervisor-subordinate relationship is the style or manner in which symbolic exchanges are communicated. The concept of communication style has been viewed from several angles. From a categorical perspective, Wofford, Gerloff, and Cummins (1977) viewed communication style as a specialized set of interpersonal behaviors used in a specific context or situation. Describing the concept of communication style as it relates to the supervisor-subordinate relationship, the authors indicate 6 styles in particular: controlling, equalitarian, structuring, dynamic, withdrawing, and relinquishing. Using this approach, they maintained that "(1) each

communication style represents a category of communication behaviors which have related purposes and similar approaches and (2) a particular style will be used with consistency by a person for similar situations." (p. 148). While descriptive in nature, this notion of communication style has been criticized for lacking empirical evidence for the descriptions and lacking suggestions for operationalizing communication style (Birdsall, 1980).

A second approach to communication style was developed by Norton (1978). Norton was concerned with the way one communicates rather than what is communicated. While the main purpose of Norton's study (1978) was to establish the foundation and reliability of a communicator style construct, a comprehensive instrument emerged offering a multi-dimensional approach to measuring communicative style.

Subsequently, Richmond and McCroskey (1979) developed the concept of style from a management perspective. While appropriate to the supervisor-subordinate relationship, the Management Communication Style (MCS) construct emphasized more of a decision-making model. Thus, a major limitation of the MCS is the lack of pervasiveness in measuring communication style relationships.

In viewing expectancy theory in general, and expectations of communicator style in particular, it seems to follow that as the degree of congruity of communication expectations and experiences increases and is of a positive nature, the probability of successful communication outcomes should be significantly enhanced (e.g., higher job satisfaction, lower absenteeism, greater productivity, lower stress).

Summary

The preceding review of literature integrated the congruity of expectation and experience, the expectancy model of human symbolic activity, and the concept of communicator style, thereby, redirecting the focus of research to promote more of a

communicative perspective to the study of the supervisor-subordinate relationship. The focus of this study will be on the particular dimension of the expectancy model that seems most relevant to subordinates' satisfaction with supervisior--subordinate expectations of supervisor @ subordinate experiences with supervisor--(BTO @ BRO). **Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine whether the types of congruity incorporating communicator style expectations of and experiences with one's supervisor affect subordinates' satisfaction with supervision.** Thus, the focus of this study is on the following research question:

Do types of congruity incorporating subordinates' communicator style expectations of and experiences with one's supervisor affect subordinates' satisfaction with supervision such that

1. Type I congruity will differ from Type II congruity
2. Type I congruity will differ from Type III congruity
3. Type I congruity will differ from Type IV congruity
4. Type II congruity will differ from Type III congruity
5. Type II congruity will differ from Type IV congruity
6. Type III congruity will differ from Type IV congruity

on each sub-construct of communicator style.

METHOD

Participants. The participants of this study included the employees of the Hose Production Center of a national tire and rubber corporation. Initially, there were 186 subordinates and 19 supervisors that participated in the study. To maximize the supervisor-subordinate relationship, it was desirable to use those subordinates who could be linked with specific supervisors. Using this criterion, the study was based on a sample (n) of 87 subordinates and 9 supervisors.

Instruments. Norton's (1983) Communicator Style Measure was selected because of its pervasive usage and because of the substantial empirical support for the reliability, validity, and structural stability of the communicator style construct. While the original form of the CSM entailed a self-report measure of one's own communicator style (experiences), to reach the parameters of the expectancy model underlying the present study, the CSM was reworded to include subordinate perceptions of one's supervisor (area manager) and modified to reflect not only communicator style experiences, but also, communicator style expectations. Thus, the modified Communicator Style Measure (see Appendix D) for the employees consisted of the communicator style expectations of their supervisor (area manager) and communicator style experiences with their supervisor (area manager).

The relationship between communication variables and job satisfaction has been a major concern of researchers across a variety of disciplines (e.g., Foa, 1957; Infante & Gorden, 1989; Infante & Gorden, 1981; Hatfield & Huseman, 1982; Pincus, 1986; Skaret & Bruning, 1986; Wiggins, Lederer, Salkowe, & Rys, 1983). While job satisfaction has been operationalized a number of different ways, Wheeless, Wheeless, & Howard (1984) stated "The dimensional structure used most frequently is that of Smith, et al, (1969)" (p. 222). Although the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) consists of 5 factors relating to job satisfaction (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), for the purpose of this study which focuses on the supervisor-subordinate relationship in particular, the only relevant dimension is satisfaction with supervision.

Finally, items regarding general demographic information--job title, shift, length of time with the organization, age, and gender--were included in the survey. Such data may provide a useful starting point for further research.

Data Collection. One week prior to the collection of data, the public relations department of the corporation published in the employee newsletter an announcement encouraging the employees of the Hose Production Center to participate voluntarily in an upcoming university related study of organizational communication. During their shift, the employees were given release time in staggered intervals to complete the survey. This approach eliminated any problems associated with a take-home survey and reduced the risk contaminating the data due to discussion. After completing the surveys, the participants placed them in a designated drop-box. At the end of the each shift, the surveys were collected and returned to the researcher. Anonymity and confidentiality were assured.

Data Analysis. A single factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze satisfaction with supervision (dependent variable) by type of congruity of subordinates' expectations of and experiences with one's supervisor (independent variable) for each sub-construct of communicator style. For each ANOVA that revealed an overall F statistic that is significant, the Scheffé S procedure was used to evaluate all a posteriori contrasts among means of the 4 congruity types. The Scheffé S procedure was selected over other post hoc analyses for several reasons. Kirk (1982) indicated that "The Scheffé S procedure is one of the most flexible, conservative, and robust data snooping procedures available" (p. 121). More importantly, Kirk noted that the Scheffé S procedure can be used with unequal n's and is robust with respect to violation of its normality and equal variance assumptions. A confidence level of .05 was used.

RESULTS

Computing a single factor ANOVA for each communicator style sub-construct revealed an overall F statistic that was significant for 8 of the 11 sub-constructs (See Tables E-1 through E-11). The following communicator style sub-constructs were found

to be significant overall: friendly [F (3, 83) = 14.996, p<.0001], impression leaving [F (3, 83) = 10.039, p<.0001], relaxed [F (3, 83) = 12.058, p<.0001], contentious/argumentative [F (3, 83) = 7.361, p<.0002], attentive [F (3, 83) = 9.091, p<.0001], precise [F (3, 83) = 9.865, p<.0001], dominant [F (3, 83) = 8.283, p<.0001], and communicator image [F (3, 83) = 14.569, p<.0001]. The sub-constructs animated/expressive, dramatic, and open were not found to be significant overall.

Since an overall F statistic was significant for 8 of the sub-constructs, post hoc analyses using the Scheffé S (p<.05) procedure were conducted. The results of a comparison of congruity types follow for friendly, impression leaving, relaxed, contentious/argumentative, attentive, precise, dominant, and communicator image.

Friendly. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity (M = 8.789, SD = 4.66) was not significantly different from those with Type II congruity (M = 7.429, SD = 3.897). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity was significantly different from those with Type III congruity (M = 13.625, SD = 4.410) and Type IV congruity (M = 14.184, SD = 3.400). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type II congruity was also significantly different from those with Type III congruity and Type IV congruity. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type III congruity was not significantly different from those with Type IV congruity.

Insert Table E-1 about here

Impression leaving. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity (M = 9.043, SD = 4.968) was not significantly different from those with Type II congruity (M = 8.091, SD = 2.879). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity was significantly different from those

with Type III congruity (M = 13.941, SD = 3.325) and Type IV congruity (M = 13.722, SD = 4.399). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type II congruity was also significantly different from those with Type III congruity and Type IV congruity. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type III congruity was not significantly different from those with Type IV congruity.

Insert Table E-2 about here

Relaxed. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity (M = 9.000, SD = 3.948) was not significantly different from those with Type II congruity (M = 7.700, SD = 4.692). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity was significantly different from those with Type III congruity (M = 13.591, SD = 4.837) and Type IV congruity (M = 14.233, SD = 3.431). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type II congruity was also significantly different from those with Type III congruity and Type IV congruity. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type III congruity was not significantly different from those with Type IV congruity.

Insert Table E-3 about here

Contentious/Argumentative. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity (M = 14.280, SD = 3.410) was not significantly different from those with Type II congruity (M = 12.000, SD = 4.461). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity was significantly different from those with Type III congruity (M = 7.083, SD = 4.889). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity was not significantly different from those with Type IV congruity (M = 11.517, SD = 4.830). The mean of

satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type II congruity was significantly different from those with Type III congruity. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type II congruity was not significantly different from those with Type IV congruity. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type III congruity was significantly different from those with Type IV congruity.

Insert Table E-4 about here

Attentive. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity (M = 9.821, SD = 5.264) was not significantly different from those with Type II congruity (M = 8.308, SD = 4.151). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity was significantly different from those with Type III congruity (M = 13.727, SD = 3.254) and Type IV congruity (M = 14.292, SD = 3.850). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type II congruity was also significantly different from those with Type III congruity and Type IV congruity. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type III congruity was not significantly different from those with Type IV congruity.

Insert Table E-5 about here

Precise. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity (M = 9.821, SD = 5.264) was not significantly different from those with Type II congruity (M = 8.308, SD = 4.151), Type III congruity (M = 13.727, SD = 3.254), and Type IV congruity (M = 14.292, SD = 3.850). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type II congruity was significantly different from those with Type III congruity and Type IV congruity. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for

subordinates with Type III congruity was not significantly different from those with Type IV congruity.

Insert Table E-6 about here

Dominant. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity (M = 10.083, SD = 4.449) was not significantly different from those with Type II congruity (M = 7.429, SD = 2.760) and Type III congruity (M = 12.769, SD = 4.729). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity was significantly different from those with Type IV congruity (M = 14.419, SD = 4.264). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type II congruity was not significantly different from those with Type III congruity. However, the mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type II congruity was significantly different from those with Type IV congruity. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type III congruity was not significantly different from those with Type IV congruity.

Insert Table E-7 about here

Communicator Image. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity (M = 10.071, SD = 4.455) was not significantly different from those with Type II congruity (M = 8.056, SD = 4.621). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type I congruity was significantly different from those with Type III congruity (M = 13.688, SD = 3.572) and Type IV congruity (M = 15.280, SD = 3.103). The mean of satisfaction with supervision for subordinates with Type II congruity was also significantly different from those with Type III congruity and Type IV congruity. The mean of satisfaction with supervision for

subordinates with Type III congruity was not significantly different from those with Type IV congruity.

Insert Table E-8 about here

To summarize, these results revealed a consistent pattern for the sub-constructs friendly, impression leaving, relaxed, attentive, and communicator image. In general, subordinates with Type I congruity did not differ significantly from those with Type II congruity, and subordinates with Type III congruity did not differ significantly from Type IV congruity. However, subordinates with Type I congruity and Type II congruity did significantly differ from those with Type III and Type IV congruity. The results of sub-constructs contentious/argumentative, precise, and dominant were also significant; however, they did not follow the same pattern as the other 5 sub-constructs. For the sub-construct contentious/argumentative, subordinates with Type III congruity were significantly different from those with Type I congruity, Type II congruity and Type IV congruity; however, subordinates with the latter three types of congruity did not significantly differ from each other. For the sub-construct precise, subordinates with Type I congruity did not differ from those with Type II congruity, Type III congruity, and Type IV congruity. However, subordinates with Type II congruity were significantly different from those with Type III congruity and Type IV congruity, which were not significantly different from each other. For the sub-construct dominant, subordinates with Type III congruity did not differ from Type I congruity, Type II congruity, and Type IV congruity. However, subordinates with Type IV congruity were significantly different from those with Type I congruity and Type II congruity, which were not significantly different from each other. Finally, the results of the remaining sub-constructs,

animated/expressive, dramatic, and open did not produce an overall significant F statistic; therefore, no post hoc comparisons were preformed.

Insert Tables E-9--E-11 about here

DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicated that satisfaction with supervision is influenced by the different types of congruity and by the nature of the communicator style sub-constructs. For 5 of the sub-constructs (friendly, impression leaving, relaxed, attentive, and communicator image), a general pattern emerged. Subordinates with Type IV congruity (high expectation--high experience) had the highest rating of satisfaction with supervision, and subordinates with Type III congruity (low expectation--high experience) had the second highest rating of satisfaction with supervision. In addition, subordinates with Type II congruity (high expectation--low experience) had the lowest rating of satisfaction with supervision, and subordinates with Type I congruity (low expectation--low experience) had the second lowest rating of satisfaction with supervision. This finding leads to 2 important points that have not been addressed in the literature. First, strong congruity does not necessarily lead to high satisfaction. Even though Type I congruity is "strong," it appears to produce low satisfaction with supervision because expectations and experiences are both low. Second, weak congruity does not necessarily lead to low satisfaction. Even though Type III congruity is "weak," it appears to result in high satisfaction with supervision, possibly because experiences exceeded expectations.

The second important finding of this study is that satisfaction with supervision appears to be influenced not only by the type of congruity but also by the nature of the communicator style sub-constructs. While 5 of the communicator style sub-constructs

followed a distinct pattern regarding satisfaction, 3 sub-constructs (contentious/argumentative, dominant, and precise) deviated slightly from that pattern. In particular, when experiences exceeded expectations (Type III congruity) for contentious/argumentative, satisfaction with supervision was especially low. While this result contrasts with the finding above involving more desirable style sub-constructs (friendly, impression leaving, relaxed, attentive, and communicator image), the undesirable nature of the sub-construct contentious/argumentative accounts for the contradiction. This suggests that the desirability of the sub-constructs of communicator style should be taken into consideration when examining the influence of congruity of expectations and experiences upon satisfaction with supervision.

In general, one would expect that the nature of the sub-construct dominant would follow that of contentious/argumentative, for they both seem to be undesirable communication styles. However, the nature of the sub-construct dominant may be viewed as forceful, compelling, aggressive, and exhibiting a high degree of competency; these are characteristics that may suggest a different perceptual interpretation of a person's behavior than those characterized by the sub-construct contentious/argumentative. Although the sub-construct dominant may not carry the same negative association as the sub-construct contentious/argumentative, it may or may not be considered as an undesirable communicator style. Nevertheless, the sub-construct dominant seemed to follow the general pattern of the 5 sub-constructs discussed initially (friendly, impression leaving, relaxed, attentive, and communicator image) to the exclusion of subordinates with Type III congruity. In this case, subordinates with Type III congruity did not differ significantly from the other types. While the other differences were small, the common pattern still emerged such that subordinates with Type IV congruity had the highest satisfaction followed by Type III congruity, Type I congruity,

and Type II congruity. Schutz's (1958) interpersonal needs--inclusion, affection, and control may be the issue here. Given the nature of the organization, the task, and the supervisor-subordinate relationship, these subordinates may have a high need to be dominated (controlled) by their supervisors. This finding is consistent with Wernimont's (1971) study in which he found that subordinates expected their supervisors to provide overall direction and goal setting while allowing employees freedom to accomplish goals independently. This would account for subordinates with Type IV congruity (high expectation--high experience) having the highest satisfaction. Subordinates who had a high expectation of their supervisor to be dominant and a low experience (Type II congruity) had the lowest satisfaction. This low satisfaction may be explained by the fact that subordinates' expectations exceeded their experiences. That is, subordinates who had a high expectation of their supervisor to exhibit a dominant communicator style and then experienced low dominance is indicative of a situation in which expectations are not being met, thereby, resulting in low satisfaction.

The sub-construct precise also seemed to follow the general pattern of the 5 sub-constructs discussed initially (friendly, impression leaving, relaxed, attentive, and communicator image) with 1 exception. In this case Subordinates with Type I congruity did not differ significantly from the other three; however, regarding satisfaction with supervision, this sub-construct followed the same pattern such that subordinates with Type IV congruity had the highest satisfaction, followed by subordinates with Type III congruity, Type I congruity, and Type II congruity. An explanation for subordinates with Type I congruity not differing from the other three types may be that the nature of their task may be simplistic enough such that precision may not be required due to the degree of standardization and routineness. Therefore, if the need for precision is generally low, congruity of low expectations and low experiences may not be an issue.

The remaining 3 sub-constructs--animated/expressive, dramatic, and open--did not produce overall significant F statistics. Communicators with animated/expressive, dramatic, and open styles exert more energy and invite a certain kind of risk during an interaction (Norton, 1983). The animated/expressive communicator frequently uses physical (e.g., facial expressions) and nonverbal cues (e.g., gestures) during interaction, and "the dramatic communicator manipulates messages through exaggerations, fantasies, stories, metaphors, rhythm, voice, and other stylistic devices to highlight, understate, or alter literal meaning" (p. 129). Perhaps the kind of relationship that exists between these subordinates and their supervisors does not lend itself to these types of communicator styles. In this particular sample, the relationship may be one of a highly impersonal nature possibly due to the nature of the organization, the size of the organization, and the nature of the environment in which the supervisor-subordinate relationship occurs (e.g., loud noise resulting from large machinery).

In general, this study offers some insight for the influence of specific communication behaviors that are expected and experienced by subordinates. Incorporating the dimension of "communicator style" as being representative of one's unique expression of symbolic activity, the notion of congruity suggests a rich orientation from which to explore supervisor-subordinate interaction from a truly "communication perspective."

References

Baird, J. E., & Deibolt, J. C. (1976). Role Congruence, communication, superior-subordinate relations, and employee satisfaction in organizational hierarchies. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 40, 260-267.

Boyd, B., & Jensen, J. M. (1972). Perceptions of the first-line authority: A study in supervisor-subordinate communication. Academy of Management Journal, 15, 331-342.

Cahn, D. D. (1986). The role of perceived understanding in supervisor-subordinate communication and organizational effectiveness. Central States Speech Journal, 37, 19-26.

Foa, U. G. (1957). Relation of workers expectation to satisfaction with supervisor. Personnel Psychology, 10, 161-168.

Galbraith, J., & Cummings, L. L. (1967). An empirical investigation of the motivational determinants of task performance: Interactive effects between valence-instrumentality and motivation-ability. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 2, 237-257.

Georgopolous, B. S., Mahoney, G. M., & Jones, N. W. (1957). A path-goal approach to productivity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 41, 345-353.

Greene, C. N. (1972). Relationships among role accuracy, compliance, performance evaluation, and satisfaction within managerial dyads. Academy of Management Journal, 15, 205-216.

Hatfield, J. D., & Huseman, R. C. (1982). Perceptual congruence about communication as related to satisfaction: Moderating effects of individual characteristics. Academy of Management Journal, 25, 349-358.

Heider, F. (1958). The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. p. 20-25.

Heneman, H. G., & Schwab, D. P. (1972). Evaluation of research on expectancy theory predictions of employee performance. Psychological Bulletin, 78, 1-9.

Infante, D. A., & Gordon, W. I. (1989). Argumentativeness amd affirming communicator style as predictors of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with subordinates. Communication Quarterly, 37, 81-90.

Infante, D. A., & Gordon, W. I. (1981). Similarities and differences in the communicator styles of superiors and subordinates: Relations to subordinate satisfaction. Communication Qua rly, 30, 67-71.

Jorgensen, J. D., Slaughter, G. Z. & Petelle, J. L. (1988, May). A preliminary analysis of communicative expectation behaviors in supervisor-subordinate relationships. Paper presented to the Organizational Communication Division at the meeting of the International Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

Kirk, R. E. (1982). Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences. Belmont: Brooks/Cole.

Lawler, E. E., & Porter, L. W. (1967). Antecedent attitudes of effective managerial job performance. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 2, 122-142.

Lewin, K. (1938). The conceptual representation and the measurement of psychological forces. Durhan: Drake University Press.

Machin, J. (1977). Using the expectations approach to improve managerial communication and organisational [sic] effectiveness. Management Decision, 15, 259-277.

Machin, J. (1973). Measuring the effectiveness of an organisation's management control systems: The expectations approach. Management Decision, 11, 260-281.

Maddi, S. R., Hoover, M., & Kobasa, S. C. (1982). Alienation and exploratory behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 884-890.

Matsui, T., & Ohtsuka, Y. (1978). Within-person expectancy theory predictions of supervisory consideration and structure behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 128-131.

Newcomb, T.M. (1961). The Acquaintance Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Norton, R. W. (1983). Communicator style: Theory, applications, and measures. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Norton, R. W. (1978). Foundation of a communicator style construct. Human Communication Research, 4, 99-112.

Pazy, A., & Zin R. (1987). A contingency approach to consistency: A challenge to prevalent views. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 30, 84-101.

Petelle, J. L., Slaughter, G. Z., & Jorgensen, J. D. (1988). New explorations in organizational relationships: An expectancy model of human symbolic activity. The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 53, 293-306.

Pincus, J. D. (1986). Communication satisfaction, job satisfaction, and job performance. Human Communication Research, 12, 395-419.

Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. (1968). Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood, IL: Irwin-Dorsey.

Richmond, V., & McCroskey, J. (1979). Management communication style, tolerance for disagreement, and innovativeness as predictors of employee satisfaction: A comparison of single-factor, two-factor, and multiple-factor approaches. In D. Nimmo (Ed.). Communication Yearbook 3 (pp. 150-163). New Brunswick, N. J.: Transaction.

Russell, J. C., Studstill, O. L., & Grant, R. M. (1981). Effects of expectancies on intrinsic motivation. Psychological Reports, 49, 423-428.

Schutz, W. (1958). FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Rinehart.

Skaret, D. J., & Bruning, N. S. (1986). Attitudes about the work group: An added moderator of the relationship between leader behavior and job satisfaction. Group and Organization Studies, 11, 254-279.

Slaughter, G. Z., Petelle, J. L., & Jorgensen, J. D. (1990, April). A dimensional approach to communication expectations: An examination of "within" and "between" person congruency of communicative behaviors in supervisor-subordinate relationships. Paper presented to the Organizational Communication Division at the annual meeting of the Central States Communication Association.

Slaughter, G. Z., Petelle, J. L., & Jorgensen, J. D. (1987, May). New explorations in organizational communication: Toward an expectancy model of human symbolic activity in supervisor-subordinate relationships. Paper presented to the Organizational Communication Division at the meeting for the International Communication Association, Montreal.

Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C.L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction of work and retirement. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Snyder, R.A., & Bruning N.S. (1985). Quality of vertical dyad linkages: Congruence of supervisor and subordinate competence and role stress as explanatory variables. Group & Organization Studies, 10, 81-94.

Thayer, L. O. (1961). Administrative communication. Homewood: Richard D. Irwin.

Tolman. E.C. (1932). Purposive behavior in animals and men. New York: Century.

Tsui, A. S. (1984). A multiple constituency framework in managerial reputational effectiveness. In J. G. Hunt, D. Hosking, C. A. Chriesheim, & R. Stewart (Eds.), Leaders and managers: International perspectives on managerial behavior and leadership (pp. 28-44). New York: Perganon.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.

Wernimont, P. F. (1971). What supervisors and subordinates expect of each other. Personnel Journal, 12, 204-208.

Wheeless, L. R., Wheeless, V. E., & Howard, R. D. (1984). The relationships of communication with supervisor and decision-participation to employee job satisfaction. Communication Quarterly, 32, 222-232.

White, M. C. (1977). An analysis of the relationship between superior-subordinate perceptual congruity/incongruity and subordinate communication satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia.

Wiggins, J. D., Lederer, D. A., Salkowe, A., & Rys, G.S. (1983). Job satisfaction related to tested congruence and differentiation. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 23, 112-121.

Wofford, J. C., Gerloff, E. A., & Cummins, R. C. (1977). Organizational communication: The keystone to managerial effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Appendix A

The General Components of the Expectancy Model of Human Symbolic Activity in the Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship

Component	Subject	Cognitive Act	Object
PTO	(P) = Supervisor	(T) = Expectation	(O) = Other
PRO	(P) = Supervisor	(R) = Experience	(O) = Other
PTS	(P) = Supervisor	(T) = Expectation	(S) = Self
PRS	(P) = Supervisor	(R) = Experience	(S) = Self
BTO	(B = Subordinate	(T) = Expectation	(O) = Other
BRO	(B) = Subordinate	(R) = Experience	(O) = Other
BTS	(B) = Subordinate	(T) = Expectation	(S) = Self
BRS	(B) = Subordinate	(R) = Experience	(S) = Self

Appendix B

Dimensions of the Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship

Subject	Cognitive Act	Object
P = Supervisor	T = Expectation	O = Other
B = Subordinate	R = Experience	S = Self

1.	PTS @ PTS	17.	PRS @ PTS	33.	BTS @ PTS	49.	BRS @ PTS
2.	PTS @ PTO	18.	PRS @ PTO	34.	BTS @ PTO	50.	BRS @ PTO
3.	PTS @ PRS	19.	PRS @ PRS	35.	BTS @ PRS	51.	BRS @ PRS
4.	PTS @ PRO	20.	PRS @ PRO	36.	BTS @ PRO	52.	BRS @ PRO
5.	PTS @ BTS	21.	PRS @ BTS	37.	BTS @ BTS	53.	BRS @ BTS
6.	PTS @ BTO	22.	PRS @ BTO	38.	BTS @ BTO	54.	BRS @ BTO
7.	PTS @ BRS	23.	PRS @ BRS	39.	BTS @ BRS	55.	BRS @ BRS
8.	PTS @ BRO	24.	PRS @ BRO	40.	BTS @ BRO	56.	BRS @ BRO
9.	PTO @ PTS	25.	PRO @ PTS	41.	BTO @ PTS	57.	BRO @ PTS
10.	PTO @ PTO	26.	PRO @ PTO	42.	BTO @ PTO	58.	BRO @ PTO
11.	PTO @ PRS	27.	PRO @ PRS	43.	BTO @ PRS	59.	BRO @ PRS
12.	PTO @ PRO	28.	PRO @ PRO	44.	BTO @ PRO	60.	BRO @ PRO
13.	PTO @ BTS	29.	PRO @ BTS	45.	BTO @ BTS	61.	BRO @ BTS
14.	PTO @ BTO	30.	PRO @ BTO	46.	BTO @ BTO	62.	BRO @ BTO
15.	PTO @ BRS	31.	PRO @ BRS	47.	BTO @ BRS	63.	BRO @ BRS
16.	PTO @ BRO	32.	PRO @ BRO	48.	BTO @ BRO	64.	BRO @ BRO

Appendix C

"Within-Person" and "Between-Person" Dimensions of the Expectancy Model of Human Symbolic Activity

Within-Person Dimensions		Between-Person Dimensions	
Supervisors	Subordinates	PTS @ BTO	PTS @ BTS
PTS @ PTO	BTS @ BTO	PTS @ BRO	PTO @ BTO
PTS @ PRS	BTS @ BRS	PTO @ BTS	PRS @ BRS
PTS @ PRO	BTS @ BRO	PTO @ BRS	PRO @ BRO
PTO @ PRS	BTO @ BRS	PRS @ BTO	PTS @ BRS
PTO @ PRO	BTO @ BRO	PRS @ BRO	PTO @ BRO
PRS @ PRO	BRS @ BRO	PRO @ BTS	PRS @ BTS
		PRO @ BRS	PRO @ BTO

Appendix D

COMMUNICATION SURVEY

GENERAL INFORMATION

Job Title or Position _____

Please check the appropriate responses to the following items.

Shift

12 Hour	8 Hour
___1st shift	___1st shift
___2nd shift	___2nd shift
	___3rd shift

Length of time with organization

___ 0 to 5 years
___ 6 to 10 years
___ 11 to 15 years
___ 16 to 20 years
___ 21 to 25 years
___ 26 to 30 years
___ over 30 years

Age

___ 18 to 25 years
___ 26 to 30 years
___ 31 to 35 years
___ 36 to 40 years
___ 41 to 45 years
___ 46 to 50 years
___ over 50 years

Gender

___ Male
___ Female

COMMUNICATOR STYLE EXPECTATIONS AND EXPERIENCES

Employee's Perception of Area Manager

Instructions: You have impressions of your area manager as a communicator. The impressions include your sense of the way he/she communicates. This survey focuses on your sensitivity to the way your area manager communicates or what is called communicator style. The items are not designed to look at what is communicated; rather, they explore the way in which you perceive your area manager to communicate. Because there is no such thing as a "correct" style of communication, none of the following items have right or wrong answers. Please do not spend much time on the items. Let your first inclination be your guide. Try to answer as honestly as possible. All responses will be strictly confidential.

Using the rating scales below rate each item by circling the number which best describes the communicator style expectations and experiences you have with your area manager. Each item contains two parts. For example, the first item (be comfortable with all varieties of people) should be read in this manner:

a. I expect my area manager to be comfortable with all varieties of people. (Expectations)
b. In actuality, my area manager is comfortable with all varieties of people. (Experiences)

Rating Scales

Expectations	**Experiences**
(1) Strongly Disagree	(1) Strongly Disagree
(2) Disagree	(2) Disagree
(3) Undecided	(3) Undecided
(4) Agree	(4) Agree
(5) Strongly Agree	(5) Strongly Agree

		I expect my area manager to						In actuality, my area manager					
01.	be comfortable with all varieties of people.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
02.	laugh easily.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
03.	readily express admiration for others.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
04.	leave an impression on employees by the way he/she says something.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
05.	leave an impression which employees tend to remember.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
06.	habitually acknowledge verbally employee's contributions to be friendly.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
07.	be a very good communicator.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
08.	have some nervous mannerisms in his/her speech.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5

Rating Scales

Expectations	**Experiences**
(1) Strongly Disagree	(1) Strongly Disagree
(2) Disagree	(2) Disagree
(3) Undecided	(3) Undecided
(4) Agree	(4) Agree
(5) Strongly Agree	(5) Strongly Agree

		I expect my area manager to						In actuality, my area manager					
09.	be a very relaxed communicator.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	be very quick to challenge when he/she disagrees.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	repeat back exactly what was said.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	recognize the sound of my voice.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	be a very precise communicator.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	leave a definite impression on employees.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	be affected by his/her nervousness due to the rhythm or flow of his/her speech.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	come across as a relaxed speaker when under pressure.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	reflect what he/she is feeling through his/her eyes when communicating	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	dramatize a lot.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	find it very easy to communicate on a one-on-one basis with strangers.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	deliberately react in such a way that people know that he/she is listening to them.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	not tell much about himself/herself until he/she gets to know me quite well.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	regularly tell jokes, anecdotes, and stories when he/she communicates.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	constantly gesture when communicating.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	be an extremely open communicator.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5

Rating Scales

Expectations	**Experiences**
(1) Strongly Disagree	(1) Strongly Disagree
(2) Disagree	(2) Disagree
(3) Undecided	(3) Undecided
(4) Agree	(4) Agree
(5) Strongly Agree	(5) Strongly Agree

		I expect my area manager to						In actuality, my area manager					
25.	be a vocally loud communicator.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	be a very good communicator in a small group of strangers.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	insist upon very precise definitions in arguments.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	speak frequently in most work situations.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	find it extremely easy to maintain a conversation with a member of the opposite sex whom he/she has just met.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	be strictly accurate when communicating.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	easily break into a conversation because he/she has a loud voice.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	physically and vocally act out what he/she wants to communicate.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	have an assertive voice.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	readily reveal personal things about himself/herself.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	be dominant in work situations	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	be very argumentative.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	have a hard time stopping himself/herself once wound up in a heated discussion.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	be an extremely friendly communicator.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	like to listen very carefully to employees.	a.	1	2	3	4	5	b.	1	2	3	4	5

Rating Scales

Expectations	**Experiences**
(1) Strongly Disagree	(1) Strongly Disagree
(2) Disagree	(2) Disagree
(3) Undecided	(3) Undecided
(4) Agree	(4) Agree
(5) Strongly Agree	(5) Strongly Agree

		I expect my area manager to	In actuality, my area manager . . . .
40.	insist that other employees document or present some kind of proof for what they are arguing.	a. 1 2 3 4 5	b. 1 2 3 4 5
41.	take charge of things when he/she is with other employees.	a. 1 2 3 4 5	b. 1 2 3 4 5
42.	be bothered by a dropped argument that is not resolved.	a. 1 2 3 4 5	b. 1 2 3 4 5
43.	come on strong in most work situations.	a. 1 2 3 4 5	b. 1 2 3 4 5
44.	be very expressive nonverbally in work situations.	a. 1 2 3 4 5	b. 1 2 3 4 5
45.	leave an impression on employees by the way he/she says something.	a. 1 2 3 4 5	b. 1 2 3 4 5
46.	be very encouraging to employees.	a. 1 2 3 4 5	b. 1 2 3 4 5
47.	actively use a lot of facial expressions when he/she communicates.	a. 1 2 3 4 5	b. 1 2 3 4 5
48.	frequently verbally exaggerate to emphasize a point.	a. 1 2 3 4 5	b. 1 2 3 4 5
49.	be an extremely attentive communicator.	a. 1 2 3 4 5	b. 1 2 3 4 5
50.	openly express his/her feelings and emotions.	a. 1 2 3 4 5	b. 1 2 3 4 5
51.	have a better communicator style than one, two, three, four, or five people (circle the appropriate number) in a random group of five.	a. 1 2 3 4 5	b. 1 2 3 4 5

Job Descriptive Index

Instructions: This survey measures several factors related to satisfaction with supervision. For each list place a "Y" beside an item if the item describes the particular aspect of your job, "N" if the item did not describe that aspect, or "?" if you cannot decide.

Supervision

___ Asks my advice
___ Hard to please
___ Impolite
___ Praises good work
___ Tactful
___ Influential
___ Up-to-date
___ Doesn't supervise enough
___ Quick-tempered
___ Tells me where I stand
___ Annoying
___ Stubborn
___ Knows job well
___ Bad
___ Intelligent
___ Leaves me on my own
___ Around when needed
___ Lazy

Appendix E

Table E-1

Single Factor Analysis of Variance: Satisfaction with Supervision by Type of Congruity for Friendly

Analysis of Variance Table

Source	DF	Sum Squares	Mean Square	F-test
Between groups	3	709.01	236.337	14.996
Within groups	83	1308.047	15.76	p<.0001
Total:	86	2017.057		

Comparison of Congruity Types*

Congruity	M	SD	n
Type I	8.789[a]	4.662	19
Type II	7.429[a]	3.897	14
Type III	13.625[b]	4.410	16
Type IV	14.184[b]	3.400	38

Note. Means with superscripts in common do not significantly differ at the .05 level using the Scheffé F-test.

*Types of Congruity

Type I = Low Expectation--Low Experience

Type II = High Expectation--Low Experience

Type III = Low Expectation--High Experience

Type IV = High Expectation--High Experience

Table E-2

Single Factor Analysis of Variance: Satisfaction with Supervision by Type of Congruity for Impression Leaving

Analysis of Variance Table

Source	DF	Sum Squares	Mean Square	F-test
Between groups	3	537.028	179.009	10.039
Within groups	83	1480.029	17.832	p<.0001
Total:	86	2017.057		

Comparison of Congruity Types*

Congruity	M	SD	n
Type I	9.043[a]	4.968	23
Type II	8.091[a]	2.879	11
Type III	13.941[b]	3.325	17
Type IV	13.722[b]	4.399	36

Note. Means with superscripts in common do not significantly differ at the .05 level using the Scheffé F-test.

*Types of Congruity

Type I = Low Expectation--Low Experience

Type II = High Expectation--Low Experience

Type III = Low Expectation--High Experience

Type IV = High Expectation--High Experience

Table E-3

Single Factor Analysis of Variance: Satisfaction with Supervision by Type of Congruity for Relaxed

Analysis of Variance Table

Source	DF	Sum Squares	Mean Square	F-test
Between groups	3	612.273	204.091	12.058
Within groups	83	1404.785	16.925	p<.0001
Total:	86	2017.057		

Comparison of Congruity Types*

Congruity	M	SD	n
Type I	9.000[a]	3.948	25
Type II	7.700[a]	4.692	10
Type III	13.591[b]	4.837	22
Type IV	14.233[b]	3.431	30

Note. Means with superscripts in common do not significantly differ at the .05 level using the Scheffé F-test.

*Types of Congruity

Type I = Low Expectation--Low Experience

Type II = High Expectation--Low Experience

Type III = Low Expectation--High Experience

Type IV = High Expectation--High Experience

Table E-4

Single Factor Analysis of Variance: Satisfaction with Supervision by Type of Congruity for Contentious/Argumentative

Analysis of Variance Table

Source	DF	Sum Squares	Mean Square	F-test
Between groups	3	423.859	141.286	7.361
Within groups	83	1593.198	19.195	p<.0002
Total:	86	2017.057		

Comparison of Congruity Types*

Congruity	M	SD	n
Type I	14.280[b]	3.410	25
Type II	12.000[b]	4.461	21
Type III	7.083[a]	4.889	12
Type IV	11.517[b]	4.830	29

Note. Means with superscripts in common do not significantly differ at the .05 level using the Scheffé F-test.

*Types of Congruity

Type I = Low Expectation--Low Experience

Type II = High Expectation--Low Experience

Type III = Low Expectation--High Experience

Type IV = High Expectation--High Experience

Table E-5

Single Factor Analysis of Variance: Satisfaction with Supervision by Type of Congruity for Attentive

Analysis of Variance Table

Source	DF	Sum Squares	Mean Square	F-test
Between groups	3	498.859	166.286	9.091
Within groups	83	1581.198	18.292	$p<.0001$
Total:	86	2017.057		

Comparison of Congruity Types*

Congruity	M	SD	n
Type I	9.821[a]	5.264	28
Type II	8.308[a]	4.151	13
Type III	13.727[b]	3.254	22
Type IV	14.292[b]	3.850	24

Note. Means with superscripts in common do not significantly differ at the .05 level using the Scheffé F-test.

*Types of Congruity

Type I = Low Expectation--Low Experience

Type II = High Expectation--Low Experience

Type III = Low Expectation--High Experience

Type IV = High Expectation--High Experience

Table E-6

Single Factor Analysis of Variance: Satisfaction with Supervision by Type of Congruity for Precise

Analysis of Variance Table

Source	DF	Sum Squares	Mean Square	F-test
Between groups	3	530.166	176.722	9.865
Within groups	83	1486.891	17.914	p<.0001
Total:	86	2017.057		

Comparison of Congruity Types*

Congruity	M	SD	n
Type I	9.821[ab]	5.264	28
Type II	8.308[a]	4.151	13
Type III	13.727[b]	3.254	22
Type IV	14.292[b]	3.850	24

Note. Means with superscripts in common do not significantly differ at the .05 level using the Scheffé F-test.

*Types of Congruity

Type I = Low Expectation--Low Experience

Type II = High Expectation--Low Experience

Type III = Low Expectation--High Experience

Type IV = High Expectation--High Experience

Table E-7

Single Factor Analysis of Variance: Satisfaction with Supervision by Type of Congruity for Dominant

Analysis of Variance Table

Source	DF	Sum Squares	Mean Square	F-test
Between groups	3	464.737	154.912	8.283
Within groups	83	1552.320	18.703	p<.0001
Total:	86	2017.057		

Comparison of Congruity Types*

Congruity	M	SD	n
Type I	10.083[a]	4.449	36
Type II	7.429[a]	2.760	7
Type III	12.769[ab]	4.729	13
Type IV	14.419[b]	4.264	31

Note. Means with superscripts in common do not significantly differ at the .05 level using the Scheffé F-test.

*Types of Congruity

Type I = Low Expectation--Low Experience

Type II = High Expectation--Low Experience

Type III = Low Expectation--High Experience

Type IV = High Expectation--High Experience

Table E-8

Single Factor Analysis of Variance: Satisfaction with Supervision by Type of Congruity for Communicator Image

Analysis of Variance Table

Source	DF	Sum Squares	Mean Square	F-test
Between groups	3	695.779	231.926	14.569
Within groups	83	1321.279	15.919	p<.0001
Total:	86	2017.057		

Comparison of Congruity Types*

Congruity	M	SD	n
Type I	10.071[a]	4.455	28
Type II	8.056[a]	4.621	18
Type III	13.688[b]	3.572	16
Type IV	15.280[b]	3.103	25

Note. Means with superscripts in common do not significantly differ at the .05 level using the Scheffé F-test.

*Types of Congruity

Type I = Low Expectation--Low Experience

Type II = High Expectation--Low Experience

Type III = Low Expectation--High Experience

Type IV = High Expectation--High Experience

Table E-9

Single Factor Analysis of Variance: Satisfaction with Supervision by Type of Congruity for Animated/Expressive

Analysis of Variance Table

Source	DF	Sum Squares	Mean Square	F-test
Between groups	3	151.229	50.41	2.242
Within groups	83	1865.829	22.48	p<.0894
Total:	86	2017.057		

Table E-10

Single Factor Analysis of Variance: Satisfaction with Supervision by Type of Congruity for Dramatic

Analysis of Variance Table

Source	DF	Sum Squares	Mean Square	F-test
Between groups	3	109.241	36.414	1.584
Within groups	83	1907.817	22.986	p<.1994
Total:	86	2017.057		

Table E-11

Single Factor Analysis of Variance: Satisfaction with Supervision by Type of Congruity for Open

Analysis of Variance Table

Source	DF	Sum Squares	Mean Square	F-test
Between groups	3	89.859	29.953	1.29
Within groups	83	1927.198	23.219	p<.2833
Total:	86	2017.057		